

### **Remarks**

Claims 1 – 9 and 11 – 19 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's detailed comment with respect to Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 12 and 15. Claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled and rewritten as new Claims 20 and 21, respectively. Claims 11 and 12 have been cancelled and rewritten as new Claims 22 and 23, respectively. The Applicants will address those items on an individual basis as set forth below.

The rejection questions the clarity of the language in Claims 1 and 2 concerning "which is used for laser-welding." New Claims 20 and 21 clarify what the laser-welding is actually referring to. In particular, the laser-welding refers to the laser-welding of a first resin member and a second resin member with a third resin member by arranging the third resin member in between the first resin member and the second resin member and irradiating laser light to the three resin members of the first, second and third resin members from a first resin member side. Withdrawal of that portion of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The rejection then mentions that the order in which the various resin members are overlapped is not apparent. The Applicants again note that Claims 20 and 21 now clarify the order in which the various resin members are arranged. Withdrawal of that portion of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12, the rejection states that it is unclear if or how a laser light can be irradiated from the first resin member's side given that the first resin member is arranged in between the third and second resin members. New Claims 20 – 23 (replacing Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12, respectively) clarify that the third resin member is arranged between the first resin member and the second resin member and irradiated laser light to the three resin members of the first, second and

third resin members from the first resin member's side. Withdrawal of that portion of the rejection is also respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 (replaced by new Claims 20 – 23, respectively) are said to be indeterminate in scope with respect to the language “additive absorptive of laser light.” The Applicants note that the second or third resin member has a composition comprising a second or third resin and an additive absorptive of laser light. The second or third resin members are absorptive of laser light because they comprise an additive absorptive of laser light. The second or third resin member may be non-absorptive of laser light, but may also be absorptive of laser light. The second or third resin member has a body having a desired shape. However, the additive absorptive of laser light is a material and does not have a shape, although the additive absorptive of laser light is included in the second or third resin member or which is included in the second or third member has a body having a shape. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the “additive absorptive of laser light” is quite clear.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 (replaced by new Claims 20 – 23, respectively) are said to be unclear because of the use of “analogous” units. The Applicants respectfully submit that this language is specifically defined in the Applicants' Specification in the text between Page 12, line 26 and Page 13, line 4. The Applicants Claims 20 – 23, nonetheless substitute “compatible” for “analogous.” Those skilled in this art are well aware that “compatible” and “compatibility” are terms of art commonly used and well understood. Withdrawal of that portion of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 15 are said to be unclear in the rejection as to how the additional additive distinguishes over the already recited additive as recited in the independent claims. The Applicants note that the “additive weakly absorptive of laser light” concept is disclosed in the Applicants'

Specification on Page 8 at line 2 through Page 10, line 29. In any event, this language means that there may be an additive absorptive of laser light and then an additive that is weakly absorptive of laser light. These separate additives may be distinguished by their relative abilities to absorb light. One skilled in the art can readily distinguish between the two. Withdrawal of that portion of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 12, 14 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by or under §103 as being obvious over JP '961. The Applicants again note with appreciation the Examiner's detailed comments hypothetically applying JP '961 against those claims. The Applicants, nonetheless, respectfully submit that JP '961 is inapplicable to Claims 20, 21, 5, 8, 22, 23, 14 and 18. Detailed reasons are set forth below.

JP '961 discloses a third resin member comprising an alloy resin material consisting of a first resin material and a second resin material in a laser-welded assembly in which the third resin member is arranged between a first resin member having transmissivity to a laser beam and a second resin member having no transmissivity to a laser beam. The strength of the welding is insufficient.

In sharp contrast, to improve the welding strength, the Applicants use a third resin comprising a polymer having at least one constitutional unit the same as or compatible with the constitutional unit of the first resin and at least one constitutional unit the same as or compatible with the constitutional unit of the second resin. The third resin is a copolymer, not a polymer alloy. By using a copolymer as set forth in Claims 20 – 23, a significantly improved welded strength can be obtained.

This is shown in the Examples. Particularly, when Comparative Example 2, in which a polymer alloy of polyamide 6 and polyamide 12 was used as the third resin, the obtained strength is only 75N. This is equivalent to that of Comparative Example 1 in which no third resin member was used. In contrast, in Examples 1 – 5 in which a third resin member comprising a copolymer as set

forth in Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 was used, a significantly improved strength of 260N to 360N was obtained.

Thus, the material used for a third resin member of the Applicants' Claims 20, 21, 5, 8, 22, 23, 14 and 18 is essentially different from that used in JP '961. This results in significantly improved welding strength in comparison with JP '961. As a result of the failure of JP '961 to disclose explicitly and implicitly all of the Applicants' claimed subject matter, the Applicants respectfully submit that JP '961 is inapplicable under §102. Moreover, the Applicants respectfully submit that they have established that the improved welding strength is an unexpected result over JP '961. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that JP '961 is inapplicable under §103 as well. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 13, 15 – 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being obvious over JP '961. The Applicants respectfully submit that they have, as noted above, already demonstrated that the improved welding strength is an unexpected result over the disclosure of JP '961. As a result, the Applicants respectfully submit that JP '961 is inapplicable to Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 13, 15 – 17 and 19. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750  
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/nn  
(215) 656-3381